

REMARKS

Claims 11-19 and 23-32 remain pending in the application and stand rejected.

As an initial matter, Applicants note that the Office Action Summary indicates that claims 15 and 26 are only objected to. However, the Detailed Action includes substantive rejections of these claims. Applicants presume that the Office Action Summary includes typographical errors with regard to claims 15 and 26. If Applicants' presumption is incorrect, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for clarification.

Applicants thank Examiner Cachet I. Sellman for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative, David W. Dorton, during the personal interview conducted September 2, 2009. During the interview, Applicants' representative explained how U.S. Patent No. 6,190,739 to Hoffer et al. failed to teach or suggest using information that identifies a hot melt adhesive to set a system operating condition, as discussed more fully below. The Examiner agreed that Hoffer '739 would be overcome in view of the arguments, but stated that the search must be updated. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the personal interview and the following remarks.

Claims Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 11-14, 16, 17, 19, and 23-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over PCT Publication No. WO 01/79111 to Bright in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,537,150 to Bowers, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,190,739 to Hoffer et al. Claims 11, 16, 18, 19, and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as

being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,719,378 to Jackson, Jr. et al. in view of Bowers '150, and further in view of Hoffer '739. Claim 23 is the only independent claim of these rejected groups and is directed to a method of operating a hot melt adhesive dispensing system having a controller operating a melting unit, comprising:

wirelessly receiving information from a machine readable element identifying a hot melt adhesive to be dispensed,

the controller utilizing the received information to set a system operating condition of the hot melt adhesive dispensing system, and

operating the hot melt adhesive dispensing system according to the system operating condition to dispense the hot melt adhesive.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claim 23 for the same reasons set forth in the Amendment filed March 2, 2009. In response to Applicants' remarks therein, the Examiner argues that Hoffer '739 discloses a machine readable element that identifies the contents of a container and includes information regarding application data for the contents of the container - in other words, how the contents of the container (a lacquer) is to be applied. (Office Action dated June 4, 2009, at pp. 8-9.) It appears that the Examiner has misunderstood the arguments set forth in the Amendment filed March 2, 2009. As noted by the Examiner, Hoffer '739 clearly distinguishes between: 1) information that identifies the contents (lacquer) of a container, and 2) information relating to how the lacquer is to be applied. It is the second type of information (i.e., information about how the lacquer is to be applied) that is used by the system of Hoffer '739 to control spraying elements. In contrast, claim 23 is directed to a method wherein

the information that identifies the material (here, a hot melt adhesive) is used by the controller to set the system operating conditions. Accordingly, in the claimed invention, the controller is determining how the system will operate based on information that only identifies the hot melt adhesive. This is clearly different from simply receiving a list of operating instructions from a label into a controller and then using those operating instructions to control a system.

As further set forth in the Amendment filed March 2, 2009, the alleged wirelessly received information in Bright '111 referred to by the Examiner (the height of adhesive in the tank, the color of the adhesive, the temperature or viscosity of the adhesive) (see Office Action at page 2) are parameters that are measured by sensors to indicate the current state of the adhesive. While these parameters may be compared with predetermined values, Bright '111 does not indicate that the predetermined values are set other than by conventional manual methods. Bright '111, therefore, does not disclose utilizing wirelessly received information that identifies a hot melt adhesive to set a system condition of an adhesive dispensing system, as set forth in claim 23.

As discussed during the personal interview, Hoffer '739 fails to cure the deficiencies of the combinations of Bright '111 or Jackson '738 with Bowers '150. Specifically, Hoffer '739 at column 8, lines 56-62 states that the bar code may include "application data pertaining to the lacquer of the color in question, e.g., for the control of the spraying elements." (Emphasis added.) In other words, the information in the bar code of Hoffer '739 is the system operation condition (it is data that tells how to apply the lacquer). Hoffer '739 therefore, only discloses receiving a system operating

condition from a bar code and then utilizing that system operating condition to apply lacquer. This is not the same as receiving information identifying the lacquer itself, and having a controller that utilizes the information identifying the lacquer to set a system operating condition for applying the lacquer. Accordingly, Hoffer '739 fails to disclose receiving information identifying a hot melt adhesive and then using the information to set a system operating condition with a controller, as set forth in claim 23. For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claim 23 over Bright '111 or Jackson '378 in combination with Bowers '150, and further in view of Hoffer '739 be withdrawn.

Claims 11-14, 16-19, and 24-27 each depend from independent claim 23 and are therefore in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of these claims also be withdrawn.

Claims 28-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Jackson '378, Bowers '150, and Hoffer '739, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,012,530 to Droz. Claims 28-32 each depend from independent claim 23 and therefore include each and every feature recited in independent claim 23. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 28-32 because the combination of Jackson '378, Bowers '150, and Hoffer '739 fails to disclose each and every element recited in independent claim 23, as discussed above, and because Droz '530 fails to cure these deficiencies. Specifically, Droz '530 is directed to an electronic label and does not disclose utilizing information wirelessly received from a machine readable

element to set a system operating condition of a hot melt adhesive dispensing system, and operating the hot melt adhesive dispensing system according to the system operating condition. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 28-32 also be withdrawn.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Jackson '378, Bowers '150, and Hoffer '739, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,700,322 to Fort. Claim 15 depends from independent claim 23. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 15 for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 23, and because Fort '322 fails to cure the deficiencies of the combination of Jackson '378, Bowers '150, and Hoffer '739. Specifically, Fort '322 is directed to a hot melt adhesive applicator having a cleaning fluid control valve for controlling the supply of cleaning fluid through an adhesive manifold, but does not disclose utilizing information wirelessly received from a machine readable element to set a system operating condition of a hot melt adhesive dispensing system. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 15 also be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe this case is in condition for allowance and respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes any issue requires further discussion, the Examiner is respectfully asked to telephone the undersigned attorney so that the matter may be promptly resolved. The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is appreciated.

Application Serial No. 10/699,404
Reply to Office Action dated June 4, 2009
Response dated September 4, 2009

Applicants do not believe that any fee is due in connection with this submission. However, if any fees are necessary to complete this communication, the Commissioner may consider this to be a request for such and charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

By: /David W. Dorton/
David W. Dorton, Reg. No. 51,625

2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 241-2324 (voice)
(513) 241-6234 (facsimile)